

Missouri Part B

**Annual Performance Report
for
2005-2006**

Submitted February 1, 2007

Table of Contents

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:	4
Indicator 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma compared to percent of all youth in the State graduating with a regular diploma.	6
Indicator 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school compared to the percent of all youth in the State dropping out of high school.	10
Indicator 3: Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:	12
A. Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size meeting the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup.	12
B. Participation rate for children with IEPs in a regular assessment with no accommodations; regular assessment with accommodations; alternate assessment against grade level standards; alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards.	12
C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level standards and alternate achievement standards.	12
Indicator 4: Rates of suspension and expulsion:	16
A. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year; and..	
B. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with disabilities by race and ethnicity.	16
Indicator 5: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21:	19
A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day;	19
B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day; or	19
C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.	19
Indicator 6: Percent of preschool children with IEPs who received special education and related services in settings with typically developing peers (i.e., early childhood settings, home, and part-time early childhood/part-time early childhood special education settings).	21
Indicator 7: Percent of preschool children with IEPs who demonstrate improved:	22
A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);	22
B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy); and	22
C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.	22
Indicator 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.	24
Indicator 9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.	25
Indicator 10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.	26
Indicator 11: Percent of children with parental consent to evaluate, who were evaluated and eligibility determined within 60 days.	27
Indicator 12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	28
Indicator 13: Percent of youth aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the post-secondary goals.	30
Indicator 14: Percent of youth who had IEPs, are no longer in secondary school and who have been competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school.	31
Indicator 15: General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.	32
Indicator 16: Percent of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint.	35

Indicator 17: Percent of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party. 36

Indicator 18: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements..... 37

Indicator 19: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements. 38

Indicator 20: State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate..... 39

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2005-06

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

The following provides overarching information pertinent to this Annual Performance Report on the 2005-06 school year.

Public reporting of data: Public reports of district data have been posted online on the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education's (DESE) website, under School Data and Statistics at <http://www.dese.mo.gov/schooldata/>. The Special Education Profile is posted under the Summary Reports for each district. A press release dated December 22, 2006, announced the availability of the Special Education Profiles as well as districts' Annual Performance Reports and Report Cards. A message was sent out on a special education listserv which includes all school districts, other responsible public agencies and various parent and professional organizations. The State Performance Plan (SPP) indicated that DESE would suppress cell sizes of less than five students, however, in reviewing the Profile as well as the state Sunshine Law, there appeared to be no need to suppress data, since none resulted in personally identifiable information being shared.

State Improvement Grants (SIG): During 2004-05, approximately 50 districts were selected and notified that they were eligible to use SIG awards for professional development activities designed to increase performance of students with disabilities. These districts worked with Special Education Consultants located in Regional Professional Development Centers (RPDC) during the 2004-05 school year to analyze data and develop improvement plans. Forty-five districts received grants in the fall of 2005 to implement their improvement plans in elementary achievement, secondary transition, or both, and 2005-06 was the first full year for implementation of the districts' action plans.

Fourth cycle focus on SPP indicators: DESE begins the fourth five-year cycle of the Missouri School Improvement Program (MSIP) in 2006-07. MSIP is the state's accreditation system which reviews all districts during the five years of the cycle. The Division of Special Education follows the same cycle for monitoring the implementation of special education in all responsible public agencies in the state. The MSIP process for fourth cycle is much more performance based than in the past, and likewise, the special education review in districts is also much more performance based and places more emphasis on improving outcomes and results for students with disabilities. Most activities that will be required of districts by the Division will be based on the State Performance Plan indicators and whether the district met the targets established in the SPP. In brief, if a district did not meet a performance target, the district will be required to develop an improvement plan that addresses the indicator not met and will also be required to conduct file reviews of compliance indicators related to the performance area not met.

Improvement plan and rubric: Due to the use of improvement planning for both SIG application purposes and for district monitoring, a template for improvement plans has been developed that will function as both a grant application and a self-assessment tool for MSIP purposes. The improvement plan is based on DESE's Comprehensive School Improvement Plan, and is a part of a new web-based general supervision management system being implemented in 2006-07. The improvement plan is structured to include a comprehensive needs assessment, objectives with targets and benchmarks, and activities with action steps and impact measures. Activity reports will be required from grant districts twice yearly so that activity implementation and progress can be monitored. An important part of the improvement plan is a scoring rubric that itemizes the factors that DESE will use when evaluating the improvement plans for either grant or self-assessment purposes. The rubric makes it clear to districts what is expected in an acceptable improvement plan.

IMACS: The Division has contracted with a vendor to develop a web-based general supervision management system. This new system has been named IMACS – Improvement Monitoring, Accountability and Compliance System. The contract was awarded in June 2006 and design work began shortly thereafter. The major components of the system include data analysis, improvement planning, compliance file reviews and corrective action plans. The system will also have components for annual disproportionality and discipline reviews and additional data collection capacity for SPP indicators not already collected through DESE's Core Data collection system. IMACS will allow districts to submit required information to the Division for either the cyclical review process or for grant applications.

IMACS will also be available for districts to use on a voluntary basis so that improvement planning, implementation and evaluation can be on-going procedures for the district, and districts can conduct compliance file reviews at any time to self-monitor compliance with state and federal requirements. Results of the voluntary self-monitoring can be used to target technical assistance to staff in order to correct areas of potential noncompliance.

Focused Monitoring: Several revisions were made during the second pilot of the focused monitoring process. Reviews conducted in 2005-06 were designed to be a comprehensive review of district performance and compliance. In order to gather more comprehensive information, RPDC consultants from neighboring RPDC regions were added to the on-site teams. This monitoring process is being used during the 2006-07 school year and will include focus groups and classroom observations as additional methods that may be employed to collect information from districts selected for review. The Division's focused monitoring process resembles the process being used for the fourth cycle of MSIP which began with the 2006-2007 school year and is expected to align with or to complement those reviews.

Consultants: DESE contracts with nine Regional Professional Development Centers (RPDCs) across the state to provide training and technical assistance to districts. There are five types of special education consultants:

- Improvement Consultants facilitate school improvement by helping to develop and implement data based school improvement plans. These consultants also participate in Reading First training opportunities and collaborate with other RPDC staff to improve reading performance of students with disabilities across all grade levels in Reading First and non-Reading First schools
- Regional Technical Assistance Coaches (RTACs) align, coordinate, deliver professional development through training staff and in-district trainers and provide on-going coaching related to implementing school improvement plans.
- Positive Behavior Supports (PBS) Coaches identify and recruit districts and buildings for PBS implementation, train district leadership, train and mentor district PBS coaches/facilitators, and otherwise support districts in implementation of PBS.
- Compliance Consultants work with districts to understand compliance requirements, conduct self-reviews, and write and implement corrective action plans.
- Blindness Skills Specialists consult with public schools in the identification and service planning for students who are blind or partially sighted.

Throughout the remainder of the document, these five types of special education personnel at the RPDCs will collectively be called "RPDC consultants" or "consultants."

Monitoring Priority: Free Appropriate Public Education (FAPE) in the Least Restrictive Environment (LRE)

Indicator 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma compared to percent of all youth in the State graduating with a regular diploma.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Measurement: Measurement for youth with IEPs should be the same measurement as for all youth. Explain calculation.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005-06	73.0% graduation rate for students with disabilities

Actual Target Data for 2005-06:

The targets established in the SPP were based on data that excluded the Department of Corrections (DOC), because DOC serves an adult population and does not issue diplomas. Inmates work toward earning GEDs, and therefore cannot be counted as graduates. In addition, DOC data are not included in data for all students since they are not considered a Local Education Agency. In the SPP, DOC data was not included in baseline data in order to best represent regular school districts' performance for use in setting targets for improvement. OSEP's response indicated that DOC data must be included in the baseline data. Therefore, revised 2004-05 data are included below along with data for 2005-06. Targets established in the SPP are not being revised as this would artificially lower the standard for all regular school districts in the state; however, this explains why statewide data does not meet the target established in the SPP. The second table below shows that, if DOC data were excluded, the state would indeed be meeting the 2005-06 target for graduation rates.

Graduation Rates						
Year	Students with Disabilities			All Students		Gap (All – Spec Ed)
	Number of Graduates	Number of Graduates & Dropouts	Graduation Rate	Number of Graduates	Graduation Rate	
2004-05	6,268	9,028	69.4%	57,814	85.9%	16.5%
2005-06	6,325	8,998	70.3%	58,355	85.7%	15.4%

Graduation Rates excluding DOC						
Year	Students with Disabilities			All Students*		Gap (All – Spec Ed)
	Number of Graduates	Number of Graduates & Dropouts	Graduation Rate	Number of Graduates	Graduation Rate	
2004-05	6,268	8,603	72.9%	57,814	85.9%	13.0%
2005-06	6,325	8,608	73.5%	58,355	85.7%	12.2%

Sources: All Students data from School Data and Statistics website as of 1/16/07.

Students with Disabilities data from Screen 12 of Core Data as of 1/16/07.

* DOC does not report data for all students

Formulas:

- Students with Disabilities Graduation Rate: $\text{Number of graduates} / (\text{number of graduates} + \text{number of dropouts}) \times 100$
- All Students Graduation Rate: $(\text{Graduates} / (9\text{-}12 \text{ Cohort Dropouts} + \text{Graduates})) \times 100$
- Dropouts include exit categories Received a Certificate, Reached Maximum Age, Moved Not Known to be Continuing and Dropped Out

Calculations for students with disabilities and all students differ due to the following:

Difference in Calculations/ Reporting	Students with Disabilities	All Students (includes students with disabilities)
Collection method	Screen 12 of Core Data by district and age	Screen 13 of Core Data by building and grade level
Exiters Reported	Students on the district's Special Education child count prior to exit during the school year	All students exiting during the school year
Graduation rate calculations	(Number of graduates / (number of graduates + number of dropouts)) x 100. Cohort dropouts not available due to collection by age, uses total number of dropouts that school year instead. Graduates include students awarded diplomas based on number of credits achieved by completing regular classes, regular classes with modifications, or achieving goals and objectives on the IEPs – see detail below	(Graduates / (9-12 Cohort Dropouts + Graduates)) x 100 Cohort dropouts available due to collection by grade level Graduates include students awarded diplomas based on number of credits achieved by completing regular classes, regular classes with modifications, or achieving goals and objectives on the IEPs – see detail below
Dropout rate calculations	(Number of dropouts / Total child count ages 14-21) x 100. Total dropouts include the following exit categories: Received a Certificate, Reached Max Age, Moved Not Known to be Continuing and Dropped Out. Average enrollment not collected for students with disabilities, uses 14-21 child count as of December 1 instead.	(Number of dropouts divided by average enrollment) x 100 Dropout categories are the same as for students with disabilities Average enrollment is collected for all students.

The following is excerpted from Missouri's guidelines for Graduation Requirements for Students in Missouri's Public Schools:

SPECIAL POLICY CONSIDERATION FOR STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES UNDER IDEA

Each school district must provide a free, appropriate public education for students with disabilities until they are graduated with a regular diploma or attain the age of 21 years. Local school boards must establish policies and guidelines that ensure that students with disabilities have the opportunity to earn credits toward graduation in a nondiscriminatory manner and within the spirit and intent of that requirement. Provisions include:

- 1. Any specific graduation requirement may be waived for a disabled student if recommended by the IEP Committee.*
- 2. Students with disabilities receive grades and have credit transcribed in the same manner as all other students when they complete the same courses as other students.*
- 3. Students with disabilities who complete regular courses modified as indicated in their IEPs to accommodate their disabilities will receive grades and have credit transcribed in that same manner as students who complete the same courses without modification; however, the fact that the courses were modified may be noted on the transcripts.*
- 4. Students with disabilities who meet the goals and objectives of their IEPs, as measured by the evaluation procedures and criteria specified in the IEPs, will have credit transcribed in accordance with the state definition of units of credit.*

5. *All students with disabilities who meet state and local graduation requirements by taking and passing regular courses without modification; taking and passing regular courses with modification; or successfully achieving IEP goals and objectives shall be graduated and receive regular high school diplomas.*
6. *Students with disabilities who reach age 21, or otherwise terminate their education, and who have met the district's attendance requirements but who have not completed the requirements for graduation, receive a certificate of attendance.*

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2005-06:

Missouri invited several districts to apply for State Improvement Grants during the 2004-05 school year, and 2005-06 was the first full year for implementation of the districts' action plans. Twenty-nine districts have been awarded SIG funds for improvement in the post-secondary outcomes of students with disabilities. Districts receiving SIG funds for improving post-secondary outcomes have participated in the following professional development during the 2005-2006 school year for teachers to support implementation of the instructional intervention(s): Nine districts have participated in Co-teaching and Collaboration trainings and eight districts have participated in Ten Sigma transition trainings. Six districts have participated in Wilson Reading training. Other trainings attended by personnel in SIG districts include Differentiated Instruction, SRA Corrective Reading, Positive Behavior Supports, Self-Determination, Measurable Goals, Life Skills, Reading 180, Transition IEP, AimsWeb/Curriculum-Based Measurement, and Data Analysis training. Additional use of SIG funds in districts went to consultants and coaches, work force related field trips, student incentives, tutoring, and curriculum materials.

As mentioned in the Overview for this APR, DESE has developed an improvement plan template for use by districts that are applying for grants or districts that are required to submit an improvement plan as a part of their monitoring self-assessment process. Post-secondary transition data will be used to identify which districts are eligible for grants or that must address post-secondary transition through the improvement plan. An important part of the improvement plan process is a scoring rubric that DESE will use when evaluating the improvement plans. This rubric is available to districts as they are developing the improvement plan so that expectations are clear. District training on the improvement plan and scoring rubric began in November 2006 and will be made available to all districts in the state beginning spring 2007. The intent is to strengthen the improvement planning process at the district level, in order to promote changes leading towards improved outcomes for students with disabilities.

DESE is working with the North Central Regional Resource Center (NCRRC) to compile a listing of evidence-based practices/strategies for improving performance for this indicator. The NCRRC is currently testing a similar web system with another state, and when testing has been completed, Missouri will review and revise as necessary prior to making it available to districts.

A training module on high quality transition planning and ways to engage students in the transition planning process to ensure students are involved in meaningful activities related to their transition to post-secondary life was developed by the DESE and Consultants. The draft of the module was completed in December of 2006. A final form of the module will be posted to the Effective Practices Section of the DESE website in January 2007. Consultants will be trained to deliver the module to districts in February 2007, with district trainings to begin in early spring 2007. Related content is also a part of compliance trainings.

A workgroup comprised of representatives from the Divisions of Special Education, Career Education, and Vocational Rehabilitation met to discuss their definitions of "disability" and to take steps to align them if needed to ensure comparability within data collected by each. The group determined that the definitions used for IEP disability and for Section 504 disability are the same within the collections. The next step for the workgroup will be to determine what data the Division will want from the other systems in order to assess the impact of services.

Information on the GED Option program was presented to consultants in July of 2006 for dissemination to the districts. This program allows students to remain in school and work towards a GED, and the district would issue a regular diploma to the students.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2005-06:

No revisions have been made to targets in the SPP, but additional improvement activities have been added based on needs determined by the Division and with stakeholder involvement. The additions involve the grant application and improvement planning processes, the importance of the accuracy of data, and collaboration with the University of Kansas regarding transition planning.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2005-06

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school compared to the percent of all youth in the State dropping out of high school.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Measurement: Measurement for youth with IEPs should be the same measurement as for all youth. Explain calculation.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005-06	4.7% dropout rate for students with disabilities

Actual Target Data for 2005-06:

See discussion of the inclusion of data from the Department of Corrections (DOC) under Indicator 1.

Dropout Rates including DOC						
Year	Students with Disabilities			All Students		Gap (Spec Ed - All)
	Number of Dropouts	Child Count Age 14-21	Drop Out Rate	Number of Dropouts	Drop Out Rate	
2004-2005	2,760	46,950	5.9%	10,097	3.7%	2.2%
2005-2006	2,673	47,466	5.6%	11,273	4.0%	1.6%

Dropout Rates excluding DOC						
Year	Students with Disabilities			All Students*		Gap (All – Spec Ed)
	Number of Dropouts	Child Count Age 14-21	Drop Out Rate	Number of Dropouts	Drop Out Rate	
2004-2005	2,335	46,433	5.0%	10,097	3.7%	1.3%
2005-2006	2,283	46,952	4.9%	11,273	4.0%	0.9%

Sources: All Students data from School Data and Statistics website as of 1/16/07.

Students with Disabilities data from Screen 12 of Core Data as of 1/16/07.

* DOC does not report data for all students

Formulas:

- Students with Disabilities Dropout Rate: Number of dropouts / Total child count ages 14-22
- All Students Dropout Rate: Number of dropouts / Average enrollment
- Dropouts include exit categories Received a Certificate, Reached Maximum Age, Moved Not Known to be Continuing and Dropped Out

See information under Indicator 1 for a description of who counts as a dropout for students with disabilities and all students. In short, the definitions of dropout for both are the same.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2005-06:

While the state did not meet the 2005-06 target for the dropout rate, slight improvement has been demonstrated. Since many of the improvement activities in the SPP were started during 2005-06, the impact is most likely to be seen in subsequent years. See Indicator 1 for more information.

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines /
Resources for 2005-06:**

No changes were made to targets in the SPP. See Indicator 1 for additions to improvement activities.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2005-06

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 3: Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:

- A. Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size meeting the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup.
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs in a regular assessment with no accommodations; regular assessment with accommodations; alternate assessment against grade level standards; alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level standards and alternate achievement standards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Measurement:

A. Percent = $\left[\frac{\text{\# of districts meeting the State's AYP objectives for progress for the disability subgroup (children with IEPs)}}{\text{total \# of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size in the State}} \right] \text{ times } 100$.

B. Participation rate =

- a. # of children with IEPs in assessed grades;
- b. # of children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations (percent = $\left[\frac{(b)}{(a)} \right] \text{ times } 100$);
- c. # of children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations (percent = $\left[\frac{(c)}{(a)} \right] \text{ times } 100$);
- d. # of children with IEPs in alternate assessment against grade level achievement standards (percent = $\left[\frac{(d)}{(a)} \right] \text{ times } 100$); and
- e. # of children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards (percent = $\left[\frac{(e)}{(a)} \right] \text{ times } 100$).

Account for any children included in a but not included in b, c, d, or e above.

Overall Percent = $\left[\frac{(b + c + d + e)}{(a)} \right]$.

C. Proficiency rate =

- a. # of children with IEPs in assessed grades;
- b. # of children with IEPs in assessed grades who are proficient or above as measured by the regular assessment with no accommodations (percent = $\left[\frac{(b)}{(a)} \right] \text{ times } 100$);
- c. # of children with IEPs in assessed grades who are proficient or above as measured by the regular assessment with accommodations (percent = $\left[\frac{(c)}{(a)} \right] \text{ times } 100$);
- d. # of children with IEPs in assessed grades who are proficient or above as measured by the alternate assessment against grade level achievement standards (percent = $\left[\frac{(d)}{(a)} \right] \text{ times } 100$); and
- e. # of children with IEPs in assessed grades who are proficient or above as measured against alternate achievement standards (percent = $\left[\frac{(e)}{(a)} \right] \text{ times } 100$).

Account for any children included in a but not included in b, c, d, or e above.

Overall Percent = $\left[\frac{(b + c + d + e)}{(a)} \right]$.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005-06	Percent of districts meeting AYP: 30% Participation rate for children with IEPs: 95% Proficiency rates for children with IEPs: CA – 34.7% Math – 26.6%

Actual Target Data for 2005-06:

The baseline data provided in the SPP for 2004-05 were accurate; however a new statewide assessment was implemented in 2005-06, and therefore no comparison can be made between 2004-05 data and 2005-06 data.

The previous statewide assessment was comprised of three grade span assessments in Communication Arts and Mathematics. The new statewide assessment program is made up of grade level assessments for grades 3-8 and a high school grade. The achievement levels and cut scores have been re-set accordingly, and proficiency targets for AYP purposes under NCLB have been revised.

A. Percent of districts meeting the State's AYP objectives for progress for the disability subgroup.

The AYP Proficiency goals for 2006 were 34.7% for Communication Arts and 26.6% for Mathematics.

Year	Subject	Districts MET for IEP Subgroup	Total Districts with N for IEP Subgroup*	Percent Met for IEP Subgroup
2006	Communication Arts	87	243	35.8%
	Mathematics	153	242	63.2%
	Combined	79	245	32.2%

* Minimum number of students with disabilities assessed in order to hold a district accountable for NCLB AYP purposes is 50.

B. Participation rate for children with IEPs in a regular assessment with no accommodations; regular assessment with accommodations; alternate assessment against grade level standards; alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards.**2006 MAP and MAP-A Participation Rates for Students with Disabilities**

	Total	Regular MAP Assessment	MAP-Alternate Assessment	Participation Rate	Absent	Not Assessed
Communication Arts	71,345	67,255	3,613	99.3%	374	103
Mathematics	73,074	68,928	3,627	99.3%	423	96

Not Assessed are students who were to take the MAP-Alternate, but did not submit a portfolio.

C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level standards and alternate achievement standards.

"Proficiency" includes the top two of four achievement levels, Proficient and Advanced, on the regular MAP and MAP-Alternate assessments.

2006 MAP and MAP-A Proficiency Rates for Students with Disabilities

	Total	Proficient - Regular Assessment	Proficient - Alternate Assessment	Proficiency Rate
Comm Arts Grade 3	10,564	2,032	389	22.9%
Comm Arts Grade 4	10,704	1,887	407	21.4%
Comm Arts Grade 5	10,471	1,506	411	18.3%
Comm Arts Grade 6	10,050	1,043	381	14.2%
Comm Arts Grade 7	10,450	859	371	11.8%
Comm Arts Grade 8	10,605	741	388	10.6%
Comm Arts Grade 11	7,263	413	301	9.8%
Comm Arts Total	70,107	8,481	2,648	15.9%
Mathematics Grade 3	10,628	2,673	392	28.8%
Mathematics Grade 4	10,702	2,277	418	25.2%
Mathematics Grade 5	10,502	1,767	413	20.8%
Mathematics Grade 6	10,048	1,358	404	17.5%
Mathematics Grade 7	10,568	1,091	389	14.0%
Mathematics Grade 8	10,616	954	416	12.9%
Mathematics Grade 10	9,104	605	334	10.3%
Mathematics Total	71,812	10,725	2,766	18.7%

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2005-06:

Missouri invited several districts to apply for State Improvement Grants during the 2004-05 school year, and 2005-06 was the first full year for implementation of the districts' action plans. Currently, twenty-five districts have been awarded SIG funds for improvement in the communication arts achievement of students with disabilities in grades K-4. Personnel in districts receiving SIG funds for improvement in communication arts achievement have participated in the following professional development during the 2005-2006 school year to support implementation of the following instructional intervention(s): Seven districts have participated in Differentiated Instruction. Six districts have participated in Wilson Reading, Data Analysis (Victoria Bernhardt), and Co-teaching trainings and five districts have participated in Science Research Associates (SRA) Corrective Reading training. Other trainings attended by personnel in SIG districts include Quality Eligibility Determination decision-making process, Measurable Goals, Reading First Literacy, Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS), Curriculum-Based Measurement, Responsiveness-to-Intervention, Aimsweb, Edmark/Reading Mastery, Accelerated Reading, Picture Exchange Communication System (PECS), Positive Behavior Support, Multi-Sensory Reading Instruction (MRI), Early Reading Diagnostic Assessment Materials, Reading Recovery, and Individualized Education Program (IEP) training.

As mentioned in the Overview for this APR, DESE has developed an improvement plan template for use by districts that are applying for grants or districts that are required to submit an improvement plan as a part of their monitoring self-assessment process. Grant eligibility and improvement plan requirements will be triggered by proficiency rates on statewide assessments. An important part of the improvement plan process is a scoring rubric that DESE will use when evaluating the districts' improvement plans. This rubric is available to districts as they are developing the improvement plan so that expectations are clear.

District training on the improvement plan and scoring rubric began in November 2006 and will be made available to all districts in the state. The intent is to strengthen the improvement planning process at the district level, in order to promote changes leading towards improved outcomes for students with disabilities.

DESE is working with the North Central Regional Resource Center (NCRRC) to compile a listing of evidence-based practices/strategies for improving performance for this indicator. The NCRRC is currently testing a similar web system with another state, and when testing has been completed, Missouri will review and revise as necessary prior to making it available to districts.

Missouri was required by OSEP to submit by February 17, 2006, a final report demonstrating full compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR 300.138 and 300.347 (a) (5) as they relate to ensuring that all children with disabilities who take the alternate to the statewide assessment participate in all of the same areas of assessment as children who take the State's general assessment. As of February 15, 2006, there were two LEAs with findings of non-compliance in that area that had not been corrected at that time; however it was not yet a year since the date of their compliance report. The two districts were subsequently cleared of the noncompliance within one year from the date of their report.

Missouri was also required to submit a final report demonstrating full compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR 300.138, 300.139, 300.347 (a) (5) as they relate to district-wide assessments. As of February 15, 2006, there were five LEAs with findings of non-compliance in that area that had not been corrected at that time; however it was not yet a year since the date of their compliance report. The five districts were subsequently cleared of the noncompliance within one year from the date of their report.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2005-06:

Targets for A, B and C have been revised in the State Performance Plan, due to the new statewide assessments that were implemented in 2005-06. The new assessments are grade level assessments for grade levels 3-8 and a high school grade instead of the previous grade span assessments. The new assessment has four achievement levels instead of five, which have been aligned with NAEP. The state's AYP proficiency targets established for NCLB were revised based on the new assessment program, and the SPP reflects the new AYP proficiency targets. The targets for percent of districts meeting AYP were revised per OSEP instruction to reflect a combined AYP determination, rather than separately for Communication Arts and Mathematics. The targets for participation have been lowered to 95% to align with AYP determinations.

Additional improvement activities have been added in regard to improvement planning and grants.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2005-06

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 4: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

- A. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year; and
- B. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with disabilities by race and ethnicity.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

Measurement:

- A. Percent = $\left[\frac{\text{\# of districts identified by the State as having significant discrepancies in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year}}{\text{\# of districts in the State}} \right] \times 100$.
- B. Percent = $\left[\frac{\text{\# of districts identified by the State as having significant discrepancies in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for greater than 10 days in a school year of children with disabilities by race ethnicity}}{\text{\# of districts in the State}} \right] \times 100$.

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005-06	<p>A: 1.7% of districts are identified as having significant discrepancies in suspension/expulsion rates</p> <p>B: See SPP</p>

Actual Target Data for 2005-06:

Discipline incidents included in this analysis are any incidents resulting in out of school suspensions for more than 10 days as well as multiple short sessions summing to more than 10 days. Multiple short sessions are counted as a single incident. For each district with at least five discipline incidents for students with disabilities, the following ratio was calculated:

- Discipline Incident Rate for Students with Disabilities (Number of incidents for students with disabilities / special education child count) to
- Discipline Incident Rate for Non-disabled Students (Number of incidents for non-disabled students / enrollment)

Across districts, a mean and standard deviation of the ratios were calculated. Any ratio greater than the mean + one standard deviation is considered a significant discrepancy.

Note that the SPP analysis was based on a comparison of rates for students with disabilities and rates for all students. Methodology has been adjusted to look at rates for non-disabled students rather than all students. The change does not affect the number of districts identified enough to cause a need for revised targets.

Another change to the methodology includes an examination of the average number of incidents per 100 students. As reviews were being conducted in spring 2006, there were a few districts that had high ratios but had very low discipline incident rates for both disabled and nondisabled students. Because of that, districts with an average number of incidents per 100 students less than 2.0 and 1.0, for disabled and nondisabled students, respectively, will not be considered to have significant discrepancies in suspension/expulsion rates. This change would have lowered the number of districts reviewed in 2005-06 by two.

A third change to the methodology involves a review of two year's of data rather than just one. Due to the variability of suspension/expulsion data, a district will not be determined to have significant discrepancies unless the discrepancies described above occur for two years in a row.

Discipline Data Summary for Students with Disabilities (SWD) and Nondisabled for 2005-06

	(A) Count of Discipline Incidents for SWD	(B) Count of Discipline Incidents for Non- disabled Students	(C) IEP Child Count Ages 3- 22	(D) Total Enrollment less child count = Non- disabled	(E) Discipline Rate per 100 SWD	(F) Discipline Rate per 100 Non- disabled Students	(G) Ratio of Rates for SWD:Non- disabled
All Districts	4,087	11,074	140,691	776,839	2.90	1.43	2.04
Districts with 5 or more Incidents for Students with IEPs	3,813	9,907	93,347	512,795	4.08	1.93	2.11

Calculations:

$E = (A / C) \times 100$ meaning, on average, there are 4.08 incidents per 100 students with disabilities for districts with five or more incidents for students with disabilities

$F = (B / D) \times 100$ meaning, on average, there are 1.93 incidents per 100 non-disabled students

$G = E / F$ meaning that the discipline rate for students with disabilities is 2.11 times that of nondisabled students

Source: Discipline Incident Data from Screen 09 of Core Data (Discipline)

Ratio of Discipline Rates for Students with Disabilities to Discipline Rates for Non-disabled Students

Year	Mean of Ratios	Std. Dev.	Mean + 1 Std. Dev.	Districts with Ratio Above Mean + 1 Std. Dev.	Districts removed due to low rates of discipline	Districts also identified in previous year	Total Districts	Percent of Districts
2005-06	3.45	2.81	6.26	12	4	3	524	0.57%

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2005-06:

The SPP indicated that ten school districts had been identified as having significant discrepancies in suspension/expulsion rates based on data from 2004-05. The first step in the Division's review process was to conduct data verification with those districts. The verification process resulted in four districts being dropped from the review list, since updated data reduced the discrepancies in rates below the threshold. The remaining six districts had an onsite review of policies, procedures and practices in the spring of 2006. Five of the six districts have findings of noncompliance and are required to complete a corrective action plan that will correct noncompliance within one year and improvement plans that will address discipline and behavior management within the district.

The sixth district reviewed in 2005-06 was not required to develop a corrective action plan or an improvement plan. Noncompliance was identified during the review, but the files that were reviewed were the same that had been reviewed previously during a regular compliance monitoring which identified the

same areas of noncompliance. The follow-up review for the compliance monitoring showed that the noncompliance had been corrected. The district also showed at the time of the discipline review that many strategies were being implemented to address previous concerns in this area; therefore no improvement plan was required.

The new IMACS system will include a component to collect data for the discipline reviews. This system will be used to implement the program evaluation regarding discipline that was discussed in the State Performance Plan. Subsequent improvement plans or corrective action plans will be managed through the system as well.

DESE is working with the North Central Regional Resource Center (NCRRC) to compile a listing of evidence-based practices/strategies for improving performance for this indicator. The NCRRC is currently testing a similar web system with another state, and when testing has been completed, Missouri will review and revise as necessary prior to making it available to districts. Positive Behavioral Supports (PBS) will be a part of this system.

The state-level PBS Regional Consultants are completing the School-wide Evaluation Tool (SET) training in January and February 2007. They will conduct the implementation level assessment on all Missouri PBS schools by May 2007. Each building will be categorized into 1 of 4 implementation levels based on established criteria. Buildings that score at least 80/80 on the SET will be designated demonstration sites recognized by the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. These designations will be made at the PBS Summer Institute to be held in June 2007. Currently, two districts are implementing PBS through use of SIG funds.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2005-06:

No revisions made to targets or improvement activities in the State Performance Plan.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2005-06

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 5: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21:

- A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day;
- B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day; or
- C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Measurement:

- A. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs removed from regular class less than 21% of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.
- B. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.
- C. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005-06	Percent of children with IEPs removed from regular class < 21% of the day: 59% Percent of children with IEPs removed from regular class > 60% of the day: 11.0% Percent of children with IEPs served in segregated settings: 3.50%

Actual Target Data for 2005-06:**Special Education Placement Data for ages 6-21**

	2005-06	
	#	%
Outside Regular Class <21%	73,547	57.4%
Outside Regular Class 21-60%	35,378	27.7%
Outside Regular Class > 60%	14,350	11.2%
Private Separate (Day) Facility	929	0.7%
Public Separate (Day) Facility	1,881	1.5%
Homebound/Hospital	646	0.5%
Private Residential Facility	7	0.0%
State Operated Schools	1,202	0.9%
Public Residential Facility	0	0.0%
Total Separate	4,665	3.7%
Total School Age	127,940	100.0%

Source: Core Data Screen 11 – Child Count and Placements

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2005-06:

Improvement activities implemented in the 2005-06 school year would not have had time to impact the December 2005 child count data; however it is anticipated that the funding of activities that impact decisions about the least restrictive environment (LRE) at the district level will serve to move the state's data in a positive direction. While data on LRE is not being used to select districts eligible to apply for grants, many districts are identifying LRE as a need that is related to poor performance at the elementary or secondary level. Several districts are using SIG funds to provide professional development and support for differentiated instruction and co-teaching/collaboration.

The new self-assessment process for MSIP purposes requires that districts not meeting LRE targets complete an improvement plan to address poor performance. Districts selected for grant opportunities will analyze LRE data as a part of the needs assessment and, if identified as an area in need of improvement, can address it through an objective and activities.

RPDC Consultants continue to make trainings available to all districts, using LRE training modules for both K-12 and Early Childhood Special Education.

The Division is collaborating with other partners in an eLearning project for on-line training. Training on Differentiated Instruction was offered, and to date, approximately 250 teachers have participated. DESE and the Division are planning to expand the usage in the future.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2005-06:

No changes were made to targets in the SPP. A change was made to the improvement activity regarding demonstration sites to better reflect current plans for demonstration sites. An activity in regard to increasing collaboration with general education initiatives has been added.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2005-06

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 6: Percent of preschool children with IEPs who received special education and related services in settings with typically developing peers (i.e., early childhood settings, home, and part-time early childhood/part-time early childhood special education settings).

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Measurement: Percent = [(# of preschool children with IEPs who received special education services in settings with typically developing peers) divided by the (total # of preschool children with IEPs)] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005-06	43.0% of children ages 3-5 with IEPs in settings with typically developing peers

Actual Target Data for 2005-06:

Early Childhood Special Education Placement Data

	2005-2006 Ages 3-PK5		2005-2006 Ages 3-5
	#	%	%
Home	166	1.5%	1.1%
Early Childhood Setting	1,795	16.5%	34.6%
PT EC / PT ECSE Setting	1,039	9.5%	9.7%
Itinerant-Outside - Home	3,016	27.7%	19.7%
EC Special Education Set.	4,738	43.5%	33.5%
Separate School	143	1.3%	1.4%
Residential Facility	1	0.0%	0.0%
Total Early Childhood	10,898	100.0%	100.0%
Sum of Home, Early Childhood Setting & PT/PT		27.5%	45.4%

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2005-06:

Following an ECSE Partnership meeting with Head Start personnel, a letter was sent to all school districts regarding Head Start collaboration.

Technical assistance was provided to districts to clarify the definitions of early childhood placements in late 2005.

Targeted technical assistance was not provided to districts other than the above information due to the changes in ECSE educational environments that went into effect in 2006-07.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2005-06:

No revisions made to targets or improvement activities in the SPP.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2005-06

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 7: Percent of preschool children with IEPs who demonstrate improved:

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy); and
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Measurement:

For each of

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships):
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy)
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs:
 - a. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning = $[(\# \text{ of preschool children who did not improve functioning}) \div (\# \text{ of preschool children with IEPs assessed})] \times 100$.
 - b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = $[(\# \text{ of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers}) \div (\# \text{ of preschool children with IEPs assessed})] \times 100$.
 - c. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = $[(\# \text{ of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it}) \div (\# \text{ of preschool children with IEPs assessed})] \times 100$.
 - d. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = $[(\# \text{ of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers}) \div (\# \text{ of preschool children with IEPs assessed})] \times 100$.
 - e. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = $[(\# \text{ of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers}) \div (\# \text{ of preschool children with IEPs assessed})] \times 100$.

If $a + b + c + d + e$ does not sum to 100%, explain the difference.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
All Years	To be established in February 2008 update of the SPP

Actual Target Data for 2005-06:

Not applicable for the APR – see the Missouri State Performance Plan

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2005-06:

Not applicable – see the Missouri State Performance Plan

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2005-06:

Not applicable – see the Missouri State Performance Plan

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2005-06

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

See Indicator 1

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Measurement: Percent = [(# of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities) divided by the (total # of respondent parents of children with disabilities)] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
All Years	See the SPP

Actual Target Data for 2005-06:

Not applicable for the APR – see the Missouri State Performance Plan

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2005-06:

Not applicable – see the Missouri State Performance Plan

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2005-06:

Not applicable – see the Missouri State Performance Plan

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2005-06

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

See Indicator 1

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

Indicator 9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

Measurement:

Percent = [(# of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "disproportionate representation."

Describe how the State determined that disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification, e.g., monitoring data, review of policies, practices and procedures under 618(d), etc.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005-06	0% of districts will have disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification

Actual Target Data for 2005-06:

Not applicable for the APR – see the Missouri State Performance Plan

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2005-06:

Not applicable – see the Missouri State Performance Plan

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2005-06:

Not applicable – see the Missouri State Performance Plan

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2005-06

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

See Indicator 1

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

Indicator 10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

Measurement:

Percent = [(# of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "disproportionate representation."

Describe how the State determined that disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification, e.g., monitoring data, review of policies, practices and procedures under 618(d), etc.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005-06	0% of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification

Actual Target Data for 2005-06:

Not applicable for the APR – see the Missouri State Performance Plan

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2005-06:

Not applicable – see the Missouri State Performance Plan

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2005-06:

Not applicable – see the Missouri State Performance Plan

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2005-06

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

See Indicator 1

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

Indicator 11: Percent of children with parental consent to evaluate, who were evaluated and eligibility determined within 60 days.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Measurement:

- a. # of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received.
- b. # determined not eligible whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State established timeline).
- c. # determined eligible whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State established timeline).

Account for children included in a, but not included in, b or c. Indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and any reasons for the delays.

Percent = [(b + c) divided by (a)] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005-06	100% of children with parental consent to evaluate will be evaluated and have eligibility determined within 60 days

Actual Target Data for 2005-06:

Not applicable for the APR - see the Missouri State Performance Plan

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2005-06:

Not applicable - see the Missouri State Performance Plan

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2005-06

Not applicable - see the Missouri State Performance Plan

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2005-06

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

See Indicator 1

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Indicator 12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Measurement:

- a. # of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination.
- b. # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibilities were determined prior to their third birthdays.
- c. # of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.
- d. # of children for whom parent refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services.

Account for children included in a, but not included in b, c or d. Indicate the range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and the IEP developed and the reasons for the delays.

Percent = [(c) divided by (a – b)] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005-06	100% of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, will have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays

Actual Target Data for 2005-06:

Part C to Part B Referrals for 2005-06

Total referred from Part C and eligible for ECSE	349
Acceptable Timelines	
• IEP in place by third birthday	266
• IEP after third birthday with acceptable reasons	67
Total Acceptable	333
Delay in eligibility determination and IEP development by third birthday	16
Percent Acceptable = Acceptable / (Total Eligible)	95.4%

Source: District reported data from a total of 100 districts that conducted self-assessments in 2005-06. A total of 59 of the 100 districts had received referrals from Part C.

Acceptable reasons for delaying eligibility determination and IEP development were primarily related to late referrals from Part C. In those cases, the districts had 60 days to complete the process, and were not called out of compliance if the IEPs were developed within that timeline. Other reasons included parent/child unavailability.

Reasons for delay in eligibility determination and IEP development that were not deemed acceptable include:

- Districts delaying evaluation until 3rd birthday. Misunderstanding by districts that IEP has to be in place by 3rd birthday, not just evaluation started
- Districts waiting for outside evaluation information
- Districts allowing parents to delay eligibility determination meetings.

Almost all of the children with delays past the third birthday had the IEPs in place within the month after turning three years old. One child went over by 65 days because the parent wanted an outside evaluation conducted and the district waited on those results.

The limited number of districts found out of compliance with this indicator will be required to complete corrective action plans and correct the noncompliance within 12 months of the date of their final reports.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2005-06:

One activity listed in the SPP was to determine the best method for notification to LEAs of First Steps children who are potentially eligible for ECSE on or before the child's 30th month. Due to the requirement to have parental agreement prior to the notification, and since First Steps contract requirements were revised within the Part C system, the First Steps service coordinators are more accountable for this notification. DESE staff conducted compliance training with First Steps contractors after their new contracts went into effect in February 2006, and the training included information on the service coordinators' responsibilities related to transition. Recent monitoring results show high levels of compliance with this indicator on the Part C side. Timely notification on the part of service coordinators facilitates school districts meeting their requirements to have IEPs in place by the child's third birthday. Due to this, the improvement activity has been removed from the SPP.

First Steps Consultants conducted statewide technical assistance training for transition in March and April 2006. A total of 15 workshops were held. The table below shows the numbers of participants that attended the workshops.

Transition Workshop Participants	Number of Participants
Early Childhood Special Education	268
Parents as Teachers	78
SPOE	79
Department of Mental Health	52
Other	51
Total	528

*Other included Regional Professional Development Center staff, Missouri Parent Act, Providers, etc.

In addition, Missouri is using State Improvement Grant (SIG) funds to develop and implement a more comprehensive Transition Module addressing the Part C requirements as well as the significance to early childhood special education under Part B. It is expected to be completed in early 2007, with training delivery to begin in spring 2007.

Targeted technical assistance is available to districts through consultants both on a voluntary basis and as required by corrective action plans.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2005-06:

The improvement activity that referred to identifying evidence-based practices has been removed from the SPP. This is due to the fact that an enhanced transition module is being developed and will serve as the training and technical assistance tool necessary to achieve full compliance with this indicator.

See above for information on another improvement activity removed from the SPP.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2005-06

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

See Indicator 1

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Indicator 13: Percent of youth aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the post-secondary goals.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Measurement: Percent = [(# of youth with disabilities aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the post-secondary goals) divided by the (# of youth with an IEP age 16 and above)] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005-06	100% of youth aged 16 and above will have an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the post-secondary goals

Actual Target Data for 2005-06:

Not applicable for the APR - see the Missouri State Performance Plan

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2005-06:

Not applicable - see the Missouri State Performance Plan

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2005-06:

Not applicable - see the Missouri State Performance Plan

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2005-06

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Indicator 14: Percent of youth who had IEPs, are no longer in secondary school and who have been competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Measurement: Percent = [(# of youth who had IEPs, are no longer in secondary school and who have been competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (# of youth assessed who had IEPs and are no longer in secondary school)] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005-06	To be established in February 2008 update of the SPP

Actual Target Data for 2005-06:

Not applicable for the APR - see the Missouri State Performance Plan

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2005-06:

Not applicable - see the Missouri State Performance Plan

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2005-06:

Not applicable - see the Missouri State Performance Plan

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2005-06

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 15: General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(B))

Measurement:

Percent of noncompliance corrected within one year of identification:

- a. # of findings of noncompliance
- b. # of corrections completed as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.

Percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100.

For any noncompliance not corrected within one year of identification, describe what actions, including technical assistance and enforcement actions, that the State has taken.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005-06	100% of findings of noncompliance will be corrected within 12 months

Actual Target Data for 2005-06:

A total of 118 districts and 5 charter schools were monitored during the 2004-05 school year, resulting in a total of 123 districts/agencies. Results of these reviews are provided in the tables below. The columns of the tables are as follows:

- # Findings in Districts 2004-05 – the total number of monitoring indicators found out of compliance across the districts/agencies reviewed. This is a duplicated count of districts/agencies when districts/agencies had more than one finding of noncompliance
- # Corrected within 1 Year – the total number of findings of noncompliance corrected within one year from the date of the reports to districts
- % Corrected within 1 year – the percent of findings of noncompliance corrected within one year
- % Corrected by January 31, 2007 – the percent of findings of noncompliance that have been corrected by January 31, 2007

Topic	# Findings in Districts 2004-05	# Corrected within 1 Year	% Corrected within 1 Year	# Corrected by January 31, 2007	% Corrected by January 31, 2007
IEP (30 indicators)	527	166	31.50%	510	96.77%
Initial Evaluation/ Eligibility Determination (23 indicators)	428	105	24.53%	397	92.76%
Long-term Suspension/ Expulsion (6 indicators)	19	9	47.37%	19	100.00%
Placements (2 indicators)	22	10	45.45%	21	95.45%
Reevaluation/ Continued Eligibility and Need for Services (10 indicators)	196	62	31.63%	186	94.90%
Referral (2 indicators)	85	29	34.12%	85	100.00%
Child Complaint Allegations	61	61	100.00%	61	100.00%
Total	1338	432	32.29%	1279	95.59%

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2005-06:

Correction of noncompliance within one year is a high priority for the Division. In order to assure that follow-up reviews are conducted and noncompliance corrected within 12 months, the following procedures have been put in place:

- A staff person has been assigned to coordinate follow-up reviews to ensure that reviews are completed in timely manner
- Regular data reports are generated and reviewed in order to track noncompliance that has not yet been cleared. These reports are used to evaluate the need for actions to be taken to ensure correction within 12 months
- Compliance indicators that are found to be systemically out of compliance for the district will automatically flow through to a corrective action plan (CAP). The CAPs will include timelines for correction, actions needed for correction of the noncompliance and specific information about the evidence of correction required. Districts can provide evidence of correction at any time through IMACS, and DESE staff can clear the noncompliance at any time. Supervisors will begin initiating contacts with districts six months after the date of the final report if noncompliance has not been corrected at that time.
- Each district with identified noncompliance will be assigned to a Compliance Consultant who will assist the districts in correcting the noncompliance as soon as possible after the district receives the report, but in no case later than 12 months after the date of the report

- The new web-based system, IMACS, will produce regular reports and reminders to both the Division and districts in regard to correction of noncompliance. See additional information about IMACS below

As noted above, as of January 31, 2007, 95.59% of all findings of noncompliance have been corrected. Three districts with remaining noncompliance are being sanctioned through required use of state forms, required on-going consultation with compliance consultants and required reporting to the local boards of education. Correction is expected within three months of the most recent letters to the districts or more progressive sanctions will be invoked.

There are four additional districts that did not correct non-compliance within 12 months and have not provided evidence of correction as of the time of this report; however documentation which is due by February 7, 2007. Based on discussion with the districts and the compliance consultants that are working with the districts, there is reason to believe that the documentation will be sufficient to bring these districts into compliance; however, for any district where that is not the case, sanctions similar to those listed above will be imposed.

The Overview of the APR describes the Improvement Monitoring, Accountability and Compliance System (IMACS) that will be put in place during the 2006-07 school year. The major components of this web-based system include data analysis, improvement planning, compliance file reviews and corrective action plans. The system will also have components for annual disproportionality and discipline reviews and additional data collection capacity for SPP indicators not already collected through DESE's Core Data collection system. Key features regarding the compliance file review component include the following:

- A checklist of all compliance standards and indicators will be available in the system for districts to use on a voluntary basis for self-monitoring purposes. File review information can be entered in the system and results summarized automatically. Results of the file reviews can be used by the district to evaluate compliance levels and to plan for training and technical assistance.
- Districts will be required to conduct self-assessments in the year prior to their MSIP review. Based on SPP indicator data that did not meet targets, districts will see the compliance standards and indicators that they are required to address. The results of the file review will be summarized, and the districts will submit the data to the Division.
- Division staff will be able to access the district's self-review data in order to conduct a desk review and verify the compliance calls.
- Individual noncompliance will flow through to an Individual CAP (ICAP) that functions very much like a CAP, but with shorter timelines for correction.
- IMACS will automatically send regular reminders to districts about upcoming due dates including noncompliance that has not yet been cleared.
- Various state level reports of timelines and due dates will be utilized to ensure correction prior to one year after the date of the reports.

DESE has five regional compliance consultants across the state. These consultants are working with districts that have remaining noncompliance as well as providing training and technical assistance on standards and indicators to all districts.

The December 2005 SPP, reported that three of four districts that required corrective action plans with respect to the provision of services to youth with disabilities incarcerated in local city/county jails had provided sufficient documentation that the noncompliance had been corrected. One district remained out of compliance at that time. DESE has since received sufficient documentation of adequate procedures that the district is using to identify and offer services to students with disabilities under their jurisdiction that are incarcerated in local city/county jails. Therefore, all noncompliance has been cleared.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2005-06:

Improvement activities designed to ensure that all noncompliance is corrected within 12 months have been added to the SPP.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2005-06

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

See Indicator 1

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 16: Percent of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Measurement: Percent = [(1.1(b) + 1.1(c)) divided by 1.1] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005-06	100% of complaints will be resolved within 60 day or extended timelines.

Actual Target Data for 2005-06:

Child Complaints

School Year	Total Child Complaints Filed	Total Reports Issued	Total Child Complaints Beyond 60 Day Timeline with Appropriate Extensions	Total Child Complaints Beyond 60 Day Timeline without Appropriate Extensions	Percent resolved within 60 day or extended timelines
2003-04	154	145	23	0	100.0%
2004-05	107	90	5	0	100.0%
2005-06	104	92	16	0	100.0%

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2005-06:

DESE continues to use a database to record and monitor the timelines for issuance of child complaints. Reports are monitored to ensure that appropriate extensions are made when necessary.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2005-06:

No revisions made to targets or improvement activities in the State Performance Plan

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2005-06

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

See Indicator 1

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 17: Percent of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Measurement: Percent = $[(3.2(a) + 3.2(b)) \text{ divided by } 3.2] \text{ times } 100$.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005-06	100% of due process hearings will be fully adjudicated within 45 day or appropriately extended timelines.

Actual Target Data for 2005-06:

Due Process Hearing Requests

School Year	Total Due Process Hearings Beyond Timeline without Extension	Percent Fully Adjudicated within 45 Days or Extended Timeline
2003-2004	0	100.0%
2004-2005	0	100.0%
2005-2006	0	100.0%

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2005-06:

DESE continues to use a database to record and monitor the timelines for due process hearings. Reports are monitored to ensure that appropriate extensions are made when necessary.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2005-06:

No revisions to targets or improvement activities made to the State Performance Plan

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2005-06

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

See Indicator 1

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 18: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3(B))

Measurement: Percent = (3.1(a) divided by 3.1) times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005-06	Established in February 2007 update of the SPP

Actual Target Data for 2005-06:

Not applicable for the APR - see the Missouri State Performance Plan

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2005-06:

Not applicable - see the Missouri State Performance Plan

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2005-06:

Not applicable - see the Missouri State Performance Plan

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2005-06

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

See Indicator 1

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 19: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Measurement:

Percent = [(2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i)) divided by 2.1] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005-06	62.0% of mediations will result in mediation agreements

Actual Target Data for 2005-06:

	Mediation Agreements	Total Mediations Held	Percent with Agreements
2005-06	4	6	66.7%

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2005-06:

No changes were made regarding the mediation system other than technical assistance regarding the proposed and final federal regulations on dispute resolution.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2005-06:

No revisions made to targets or improvement activities in the State Performance Plan

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2005-06

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

See Indicator 1

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 20: State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Measurement:

State reported data, including 618 data and annual performance reports, are:

- Submitted on or before due dates (February 1 for child count, including race and ethnicity; placement; November 1 for exiting, discipline, personnel; and February 1 for Annual Performance Reports); and
- Accurate (describe mechanisms for ensuring error free, consistent, valid and reliable data and evidence that these standards are met).

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005-06	100% of state reported data are timely and accurate

Actual Target Data for 2005-06:

All 618 data and annual performance reports have been submitted on or before due dates.

Data accuracy is ensured through the efforts described below.

Percent of timely and accurate data for 2005-06

Timely Data	100.0%
Accurate Data	91.0%
Timely and Accurate Data	93.0%

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2005-06:

The Division continues with data verification efforts as described in the SPP. In short:

- The majority of data required by Section 618 of IDEA and data used for the SPP/APR are collected through the web-based Core Data Collection System. A manual with reporting instructions, and data edits are important features of the system. New special education directors are trained on the system each year, with on-going technical assistance available from Division staff.
- Data editing and validation are handled by Division staff through a variety of means including year to year checks, additional data edits, reports to districts, etc. Any questionable elements are either verified as correct or are corrected by the districts.

- Extensive profiles have been provided to districts for several years and are now also available to the public. These profiles, along with using the data for monitoring and district selection purposes, have ensured more accurate data collection and reporting.
- Division staff are active members of the Department's Core Data Team, and thus have input into changes that may impact the special education data gathered and housed at the Department.
- An additional method of data verification has come about due to the selection of districts for monitoring and grant opportunities based on district performance data.

These efforts have allowed the Division to identify and correct many errors made by districts when submitting special education data. Due to this, many errors are corrected prior to federal data submissions.

Special education exiting data is one area where changes continue to be made by districts after federal data submissions. The primary reason is due to dropouts who re-enroll in school or who are found to have enrolled in another district. These students are then removed from the dropouts previously reported.

The DESE and Division are continuing to move forward with student level data collection, and intend to implement preliminary collections in summer 2007. These preliminary student level collections will run concurrently with the existing aggregate collections so that results from the two collections can be compared and reliability/validity established. Division staff is part of a DESE workgroup that is identifying and defining the necessary data elements to be collected.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2005-06:

Additional improvement activities have been added to the State Performance Plan in order to better assess, improve and enforce the accuracy of district-reported data.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
AND REHABILITATIVE SERVICES
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
PROGRAMS

TABLE 7
REPORT OF DISPUTE RESOLUTION UNDER PART B, OF THE
INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES EDUCATION ACT
2005-06

PAGE 1 OF 1
OMB NO.: 1820-NEW
FORM EXPIRES: XX/XX/XXXX

STATE: MISSOURI

SECTION A: Written, signed complaints	
(1) Written, signed complaints total	104
(1.1) Complaints with reports issued	92
(a) Reports with findings	36
(b) Reports within timeline	76
(c) Reports within extended timelines	16
(1.2) Complaints withdrawn or dismissed	11
(1.3) Complaints pending	1
(a) Complaint pending a due process hearing	1
SECTION B: Mediation requests	
(2) Mediation requests total	9
(2.1) Mediations	
(a) Mediations related to due process	6
(i) Mediation agreements	4
(b) Mediations not related to due process	0
(i) Mediation agreements	0
(2.2) Mediations not held (including pending)	3
SECTION C: Hearing requests	
(3) Hearing requests total	51
(3.1) Resolution sessions	32
(a) Settlement agreements	15
(3.2) Hearings (fully adjudicated)	2
(a) Decisions within timeline	1
(b) Decisions within extended timeline	1
(3.3) Resolved without a hearing	46
SECTION D: Expedited hearing requests (related to disciplinary decision)	
(4) Expedited hearing requests total	1
(4.1) Resolution sessions	1
(a) Settlement agreements	0
(4.2) Expedited hearings (fully adjudicated)	1
(a) Change of placement ordered	0